REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-27, 30-47, and 49-61 are pending.

Claims 28-29 and 48 are canceled.

All pending claims are currently rejected.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant appreciates the comments by Examiner Torrente and Primary Examiner Lee during the telephone interview on July 15, 2008.

During the telephone interview, it seemed to be agreed by all that the Meyer reference did not disclose all of the elements of the invention described in the application, but that the invention was not presently claimed with sufficient particularity to distinguish Meyer.

Specifically, it was discussed that the claimed "event" detection should be clarified or otherwise better defined in the claims, and more particularly that said "event" is detected at the remote image processing server. Also, it was discussed that the claimed "threshold" should be more particularly claimed or otherwise better defined such that it is clear that said threshold only applies to the in field image acquisition device, and does not apply to the server in regard to detecting said events.

Applicant has made every effort, by this Amendment, to amend the claims consistent with the discussion during the telephone interview, in regard to the issues just set forth above. Additionally, claims which contain reference to the "threshold" are amended to further clarify that the claimed "threshold" is applied to the image acquisition devices only to control when the encoder generates and transmits a feature stream to the remote image processing server. This is intended to clarify that the claimed "threshold" plays no role in the detection of the claimed "events" – and is only in the nature of a "switch" to cause the encoder to generate and transmit the feature stream.

Each of the independent claims has been amended in an effort to more particularly point out the invention and/or clarify certain aspects of the claims, in view of the July 15, 2008 telephone interview. Each independent claim now includes at least the following limitations:

- "events" are detected by the image processing server (the in-field image acquisition device does not detect events);

- the image acquisition devices generate and transmit only a reduced bandwidth feature stream to the remote image processing server;
- the image processing server detects all "events" from an analysis of the reduced bandwidth feature stream;
- the image processing server controls the image acquisition device to send all or a portion of the video stream responsive to detecting an event.

Claim 15 is amended to further include the limitations of claim 16 (which is thus canceled) regarding the camera/local encoder having two modes of operation, which are controlled by the image processing server-- responsive to detection of events. In the first mode of operation, prior to detecting any events, the encoder generates and transmits the feature stream. In the second mode of operation, subsequent to the image processing server detecting an event, the encoder is operated in the second mode in which, in addition to the feature stream, the encoder transmits at least a portion of the image stream.

Claim Rejections

All of the claims stand rejected as anticipated by Meyer, or obvious in view of Meyer in combination with Wang or Seeley. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the preceding explanation of the amendments to the claims, and in regard to the Examiner's comments in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action which are discussed above, the amended claims are believed to now be in condition for allowance.

In particular, all of the independent[1] claims have been amended herein in an effort to more particularly claim, or clarify, the following:

- an event is defined as the occurrence of a type of activity which requires some type of action in response thereto, such as the attention of an operator;

- the threshold is applied to the image acquisition device to control when the encoder generates and transmits the feature stream (i.e., the threshold does not apply to the remote image processing server, and thus does not apply to the detection of events by the remote image processing server);

- the number and type of features exceeding the threshold are indicative of activity to be further analyzed in order to detect the event (i.e., exceeding this "threshold" does not indicate that an "event" has occurred, as it does in Meyer); and

[1] Except that independent claims 32 and 46 do not include the limitation in the second bullet point. Instead, dependent claims 35 and 50 contain this limitation because independent claims 32 and 46 do not include the "threshold" limitation.

- prior to detecting any event, the image acquisition devices transmit a feature stream, not an alarm or any notification that an "event" has occurred (in fact, the claimed "event" cannot be detected until after the feature stream is analyzed by the remote image processing server).

- the claimed "event" (as defined above) is detected by the remote image processing server from analyzing the feature stream (in Meyer, the "event" is detected, in the field, by an image analysis algorithm running on the "video-sensor")

- after detecting an event, and in response thereto, the remote image processing server controls the image acquisition device to transmit all or a portion of the video stream.

It is believed that Meyer does not disclose or teach, nor is it inherent therein, any of these limitations. Wang and Seeley likewise do not disclose or teach any of these limitations.

CONCLUSIONS

For all of the reasons set forth in detail above, independent claims 1, 15, 32 and 46 (and hence claims 2, 4-14, 17-27, 30-45, 47, and 49-61, which depend therefrom), as amended, are now believed to be patentable over Meyer et al., Wang et al., and Seeley et al., either individually or any combination thereof.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of amended claims 1-2, 4-27, 30-47, and 49-61 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

TALMON, *et al.*

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 60707

Date November 13, 2008

By /Jessica Sosenko/
Jessica Sosenko
Reg. No. 47,102
(412)325-3316